

species may be specially plentiful just now in the brooks, but not any reason for the coming of the species in numbers to my garden trap, but it may be that the recent building of houses all round me, has caused my trap to be at the bottom of a wide-mouthed funnel, and that on those nights when masses of lepidoptera are drifting about high up, this funnel is irresistible.—A. J. WIGHTMAN, Pulborough, Sussex.

STIGMELLA SUBERIVORA STINT. NEW TO WEST KENT AND THE LONDON AREA—On an excursion into East Kent on 29th April last, on which I accompanied him, my friend Mr. Chalmers-Hunt discovered mines of this species, then new to the county, and his record will no doubt have appeared by this time. Having learnt from him that it could possibly occur in my own area, I searched there the next day, beginning in the garden, where there is a self-sown bush of holm-oak (*Quercus ilex*), the foodplant, in a hedge. In a few moments the conspicuous mines of the 'Isle of Wight Pygmy' were detected, and as in East Kent the blister-like mines of *Lithocolletis messaniella* Zell. accompanied them. I found only one tenanted mine of the *Stigmella*, whose occupant next day emerged and spun its cocoon; this lately produced both an imago and a parasite. I then moved to a nearby derelict garden and found the mines quite common on a mature tree of the same species. (Curiously enough the next tree to it appears to be the allied cork-oak, *Q. suber*, after which the insect is named, but none of its foliage is within easy reach; I suspect that it too is patronised by *S. suberivora*.) This moth is evidently well established in the district, and most likely all round London, though hitherto, I understand, recorded only from a few coastal localities in the south-east.—A. A. ALLEN, 63 Blackheath Park, S.E.3. 14.vi.68.

TWO SPECIES OF DIPTERA PROBABLY NEW TO BERKS. FROM WINDSOR FOREST.—On 29th May 1968, in Windsor Forest when about to leave for home in the evening, I came upon a beech from which a large portion had recently broken off, exposing a surface of fairly fresh wood. A quick inspection revealed a male *Brachyopa* (Syraphidae) at rest on the latter where the trunk had split, just above a small water-hole. From its more projecting face, thicker hind femora, and somewhat larger size it appeared slightly different from *B. insensilis* Coll., the only species with which I was already familiar, and which I had previously taken in the Park as well as here at Blackheath (in both places at sapping elms, to which, indeed, that species appears almost confined). On examination later it was confirmed as one of the other species by the presence of a small antennal sensory pit; and the practically bare arista, transversely furrowed scutellum, etc., showed it to be *B. bicolor* Fall.

This is so far the rarest of the four known British species of *Brachyopa*. It has occurred twice in Herts. ('Little Gadderton', i.e. probably Little Gaddesden, and Bricket Wood near Watford), and in the New Forest, but I am unaware of any other capture. *B. pilosa* Coll., almost as rare as *bicolor*, has been taken in Windsor Forest by Messrs. L. Parmenter and A. Stubbs, and our remaining species, *scutellaris* Desv., will very likely also be found there; it is considered to be fairly common

Of *Elaphropeza ephippiata* Fall. (Empididae), a distinctive and pretty little species, I swept a few examples in the Park from shrubby maple, etc., on 4th August 1965; and one escaped from my net after I had been

sweeping under trees there perhaps half a mile from the first spot, on the day that *B. bicolor* was taken. Collin (1961, *Brit. Flies*, 6 (1): 41) states that this 'is far from being a common British species' and records it from Gloucs., Oxon., Suffolk, Cambs. and Essex only.—A. A. ALLEN, 63 Blackheath Park, S.E.3. 15.vi.68.

NOMENCLATURE—Mr. J. L. Campbell's letter in your June issue came as a breath of fresh air in a stuffy room.

It revived memories of my crusade of four years ago against the exclusive use of Latin names, a proceeding which in my opinion effectually hamstrings identification facilities.

This academic exercise in Latin names goes back many, many years.

I have before me a copy of 'The Field naturalist's Handbook', published in 1904 and the authors of this highly informative book were those reverend gentlemen J. G. and Theodore Wood; the price of this gold mine was one shilling.

This is what they have to say on the topic.

"Nomenclature is always a difficulty in science. The love of change merely for its own sake is unfortunately given more scope in entomology than in any other branch of science, except perhaps, ornithology, and few persons who write of insects or birds can resist the temptation to alter their names.

"It is bad enough that either the popular or scientific name should be changed, but when both are altered, identification is almost impossible. Yet this is done in the most reckless manner, and without consideration for the difficulties thrown in the way of others".

I find it very comforting to have my own convictions fortified in this manner.—L. G. F. WADDINGTON, 9 Greenleaf Avenue, Wheatley Hills, Doncaster.

POLIANA NATALENSIS (BTLR.) AND *P. oheffernani* GESS (LEPIDOPTERA, SPHINGIDAE).—I was very interested to see the brief reference to Gess' paper in the March *Entomologist's Record* (80: 86), and, through the kindness of Mr. Carcasson of the National Museum, Nairobi, I have been able to borrow a copy.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Carcasson writes that *oheffernani* is definitely our (i.e. the East African) species, but that our northern specimens appear to be much bigger, possibly Gess' specimens, being bred, were a little undersized. I understand that the National Museum has specimens from as far west as Sierra Leone. Many of the specimens in the National Museum have the pair of "heavy blackish longitudinal streaks on the forewing between veins M3 and Cu2" well developed, so that "the total or virtual absence" of these is not a distinguishing feature for *oheffernani*.

I have two females of *oheffernani* from Kampala in my collection, one bred and the other caught at mercury vapour light, and there are certain differences between Gess' description of the larva and mine. The most noticeable is the fact that my larva had a fairly dense coating of short, erect colourless pubescence, which is not mentioned by Gess. Incidentally the larva of *Xanthopan morgani* Wlk. is similarly clad. The other differences are as under:—